

The University of Chicago

THE LIBERALS OF FRANCE  
AND THEIR RELATION TO THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF BONAPARTE'S  
DICTATORSHIP, 1799-1804

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE  
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF  
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES  
JUNE, 1945

By  
RAYMOND GIDDENS CAREY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1947





The University of Chicago

THE LIBERALS OF FRANCE  
AND THEIR RELATION TO THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF BONAPARTE'S  
DICTATORSHIP, 1799-1804

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE  
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF  
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES  
JUNE, 1945

By  
RAYMOND GIDDENS CAREY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1947





THE LIBERALS OF FRANCE AND THEIR RELATION  
TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF BONAPARTE'S  
DICTATORSHIP, 1799-1804

The liberals were a heterogeneous collection of intellectuals and political figures who shared with all Frenchmen, under the Directory and Consulate, the common hope for security. But they differed from the disillusioned mass of Frenchmen by continuing to demand liberal institutions and the natural rights of man and the citizen. Their convictions had been shaped by their various experiences with illiberal government under the Bourbons and the Revolution, as well as by various adaptations of the natural rights philosophy which they inherited from numerous eighteenth-century schools of thought.

One fairly cohesive group among the liberals were the "Idéologues" of Auteuil. This group included Cabanis the physician, the scholarly Daunou, Volney the traveler, Ginguené the journalist, Garat the lawyer, the poets M.-J. Chénier and Andrieux, and Destutt de Tracy, Lafayette's companion-at-arms. These were intellectual descendants of Condillac, Helvétius, Holbach, and others of the preceding generation who had used Lockean sensationalism as a weapon against traditional ideas and institutions, and the intellectual atmosphere surrounding them was materialistic, scientific, and atheistic. The center of another storm area was Necker's daughter, the irrepressible Mme. de Staël. An ambitious young Swiss, Benjamin Constant, was her current favorite, while Sismondi the economist and historian, Charles Villers the germanophile, and Camille Jordan the Catholic and royalist were drawn into her magnetic field and used in her duel with Bonaparte. The ideas of Mme. de Staël, Constant, and Villers had strong roots in romanticism and Protestantism. In another category of liberals were the economists: J.-B. Say and Sismondi, disciples of Adam Smith, and Dupont de Nemours, the chief propagandist during this period for the Physiocratic school. In addition to these intellectuals, there were several men whose liberal inclinations were revealed in their political

activities. Among them were the famous Lafayette, the laborious Carnot, Bishop Grégoire the unofficial primate of the Constitutional church, Languinais the Breton, Lambrechts the Belgian, the lawyers Thiessé and Chazal, Thibault the Constitutional bishop of Cantal, Desrenaudes the friend of Talleyrand, Isnard the engineer, Ganilh the writer, and Mailla-Garat, nephew of Garat the Idéologue.

Although the liberals lacked the solidarity of a party, a web of social relationships gave the various individuals and groups some cohesion. Furthermore, many of them had been colleagues in the assemblies of the Revolution, while the National Institute included in its membership Carnot, Grégoire, and several of the Idéologues, as well as Sieyes, the illiberal friend of the liberals whose patronage was as much of a hindrance as a help to them under the Consulate.

In spite of great differences among the liberals in personalities and ideas, they were in general agreement concerning fundamentals. They believed in the capacity of man for improvement if properly assisted by rational education and intelligent legislation. They were agreed that the primary function of government was to protect citizens in the enjoyment of personal liberty, religious liberty, freedom of opinion including its expression, the enjoyment of property, and security from arbitrary power. So long as government performed this primary function, the form of government was of secondary importance, but it was axiomatic with them that government would be in accordance with law and that the law would reflect the will of the "honnêtes gens"--the stable, educated possessors of property. The liberals were not democrats, and they feared tyranny of the masses as much as they hated the despotism of the one. Furthermore, they were human beings with ambitions and prejudices, and their ambitions and prejudices sometimes took precedence over their devotion to liberal ideals.

The liberals had a proprietary interest in the republican form of the Directory. Daunou and Languinais had helped write the Constitution of the Year III (1795), and many of them belonged to the rump of moderates and republicans that had gained control of the Convention after Robespierre's fall and that extended its dominance over the legislative councils of the Directory by enforcing the Law of the Two-Thirds (1795). That unpopular oligarchy of "perpetuals" committed many illegal actions during the succeeding



four years to defend the Republic and their own precarious positions from the dangers presented by a widespread royalist and clerical reaction and by a resurgence of Jacobinism. By the spring of 1799, collapse appeared to be near. National bankruptcy was imminent, the government was despised, outlawry was rampant, the Second Coalition was defeating French armies on the frontiers, Bonaparte was in serious difficulties in Egypt, and royalists and Jacobins were conspiring everywhere. The republicans were forced to the conclusion that hope lay only in another coup d'état that, they hoped, would unite the nation under popular leaders and establish a sound government on an improved constitution. But leadership was lacking until Sieyes, the friend of the Idéologues, became a director in June, re-established a semblance of order, and began a fruitless search for a popular general who could carry through the coup d'état, assist Sieyes in creating the new regime, and then be put aside. Lafayette, no longer an Austrian prisoner but still an exile from France, watched events nervously from Holland, urging that all adherents of liberty unite for action and assuming that he would be called upon to play a prominent part in such a movement. But the movement did not materialize and Lafayette was planning to organize a coalition of republican generals for a coup when Bonaparte suddenly returned to France and immediately became the hope of all factions for the accomplishment of their various and conflicting aims. The republicans considered him one of their number, and the liberals had no doubts that he was a member of their cult. After Sieyes and Bonaparte had agreed to join forces for a coup d'état, several of the liberals assisted in the preparations for the event. With few exceptions, they were exultant over the accomplishments of 18 and 19 Brumaire (November 9 and 10, 1799) and viewed the future with high expectations as Sieyes, Bonaparte, and Ducos became provisional consuls and swore "inviolable fidelity to the sovereignty of the people, to the one and indivisible French Republic, to equality, to liberty, and the representative system." Shortly after Brumaire, Lafayette disregarded the law and appeared in Paris. He was permitted to stay in France and, from his estate at LaGrange, watched the actions of his rival with a critical eye.

The primary duty of the provisional government (November 20-December 25, 1799) was to produce a new constitution. With a

great show of deference to Sieyes' reputation as a political oracle, Bonaparte shunted his colleague out of the public view to work on the organic law, while Bonaparte improved the opportunity to court all factions and gain a national following. The public was impressed by the moderation and humanity of the new regime, and Bonaparte absorbed the credit for the fact that a proposed deportation of Jacobin leaders was canceled, that discarded leaders of the Directory were not subjected to the customary persecution, that persons held as hostages for émigrés were released from prison, and that special taxes on the wealthy were rescinded. His judicious actions and arduous labors evoked such response that he quickly took on the appearance of the man of the nation--in contrast to Sieyes, whose strength lay in his leadership of the "perpetuals" and in the support of intellectual and wealthy groups.

Rivalry between the two leaders came to a head in the constitutional debates. Sieyes' labored scheme, constructed on the principle of "power from above, confidence from below," was highly disappointing to the liberal members (Cabanis, Chénier, Daunou, and J. B. Say) of the constitutional committees from the provisional legislative councils. For quite different reasons Sieyes' plan was totally unacceptable to Bonaparte. Daunou's attempt to introduce a liberal constitutional plan that incorporated such elements as a bill of rights and popular election of departmental officials and national legislators, was brushed aside as Bonaparte took charge of the discussions and forced through the plan that became the Constitution of the Year VIII.

Sieyes' decline was marked by Bonaparte's being named First Consul and capturing control of the administrative side of the Government. But Sieyes' wounds were soothed by the gift of a great estate and by being named as the first Senator, a dignity that carried with it a dominant voice in the selection of the members of the Senate and of the Tribunate and Corps Legislatif, the two legislative bodies. Bonaparte pleased the nation by filling administrative positions with men who were chosen because of their abilities and without regard for their royalist, republican, or Jacobin affiliations. But the public and press noted with disgust that Sieyes packed the Senate and the legislative bodies with "perpetuals." The Senate was filled with his intellectual and political friends, including Destutt de Tracy, Volney,



Cabanis, Lanjuinais, Lambrechts, and Garat. Approximately two-third of the tribunes and legislators had been members of the legislative councils of the Directory. Of the liberals, Bishop Grégoire was named to the Corps Legislatif, while into the Tribune went Daunou, Benjamin Constant, Chénier, Andrieux, Ginguéné, J.-B. Say, Chazal, Thiessé, Ganilh, Isnard, Bishop Thibault, and Mailla-Garat. Because of the auspices under which they gained their seats, these men were immediately branded in the public estimation as henchmen of Sieyes and they were never able to gain a public hearing as men of principle and independent judgment.

Although the national plebiscite was not completed until February, 1800, the new constitution was promulgated and the new government established on December 25, 1799. During the week that intervened before the legislative bodies met on January 1, Bonaparte rescinded or modified several Revolutionary laws by decree in order to repatriate about forty prominent exiles (including Carnot), put religious edifices at the disposal of the faithful, establish religious freedom, and restore rights of citizenship to the relatives of émigrés and former nobles. These actions were undoubtedly liberal in essence, but Bonaparte's preference for action by decree rather than by duly enacted law may well have startled the liberals who were inclined to take the constitution seriously and, in addition, were not at all idealistic about improving the lot of their old enemies, the royalists and Catholics. At all events, Mme. de Staël's sharp wit began to be turned against Bonaparte and her salon became a center of disaffection against the man whom she had long tried to add to her collection of promising young admirers. Moreover, a critical attitude appeared in the legislative bodies, and especially among the liberal members. Daunou was elected president of the Tribune, while Constant and Ginguéné sharply attacked the government's first legislative proposal--a measure that gave the executive control over the legislative calendars of the Tribune and Corps Legislatif. Although the Tribune approved the measure and the Corps Legislatif enacted it by an overwhelming majority, journals of every political complexion viciously attacked the opposition in general, and Constant and his patroness, Mme. de Staël, in particular. Mme. de Staël's salon was deserted and, upon the "suggestion" of Fouché, minister of police, she withdrew to the

country for a few weeks. Bonaparte maintained his public composure, but privately gave vent to his anger against the critical tribunes.

Although this experience caused the tribunes to be somewhat more restrained in their remarks thereafter, the liberals and their allies in the legislative bodies continued to offer criticism of legislative proposals throughout the session. Their opposition, however, was not unrelieved obstructionism. In general, they loyally supported measures necessary for carrying on the war against the Coalition and for reducing the royalists in the West. But they vigorously attacked every move to enlarge the executive power and criticized the numerous financial measures that were submitted instead of the comprehensive budget required by the constitution. Thiesse and Ganilh rallied a majority of the tribunes against a proposed reorganization of the Court of Cassation, and the government was forced to re-write and modify the measure. The major proposal of the session, by which the elected local officials were replaced in the departments, arrondissements, and communes by prefects, sub-prefects, and mayors, named by the First Consul, was strenuously denounced by Daunou and Ganilh because of its authoritarian implications, but the opposition failed to gain a majority in either assembly. The liberals performed a useful, although thankless, service during this session, but their efforts were rather disorganized and their pressure was uncertain. They raised no objection to Bonaparte's arbitrary suppression of sixty out of seventy-three political journals in Paris, nor did they give solid support to Constant and others of their number who urged the Tribune to exploit the constitutional provision that permitted the Tribune to receive petitions from citizens, to direct the government's attention to abuses in the public administration, and thereby to become the guardian of the public welfare.

Toward the end of the legislative session, Mme. de Staël returned to Paris from her short and unofficial exile determined to win Bonaparte's approval. Harboring the mistaken belief that his heart was reached through his intellect, she apparently hoped that her aim would be achieved by her book, De la littérature,<sup>1</sup> that appeared late in April, 1800. The work was, however, a lengthy

---

<sup>1</sup>Baronne de Staël-Holstein, De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales (Paris: An VIII [1800]).



statement of a philosophical view and a political creed that placed her in solid opposition to Bonaparte's authoritarian tendencies. She lauded liberal government, advocated the education of women, denounced militarists and priests as prime obstacles to human progress, and urged liberal philosophers and writers to demonstrate that "the art of writing is also a weapon." It is not surprising that her book only served to intensify Bonaparte's aversion to her. No action was taken against her, however, and her salon soon regained its brilliance and popularity.

Preparations for the Italian campaign resulted in Carnot's being dragged from quiet obscurity and put, as minister of war, at his familiar task of organizing and supplying the army which was to be led against the Austrians by Bonaparte in person. It was a daring act on his part, for Paris buzzed with conspiracy as soon as he had departed. All factions were concerned with preparing for the crisis that would be created by Bonaparte's death or capture. The insecure documentary sources indicate that Sieyes gathered together most of the men who had assisted in the coup d'état of Brumaire and who were annoyed that Bonaparte had outmaneuvered them. These "Brumariens" apparently agreed that their best interests required retention of the Constitution of the Year VIII and the existing order of things, but with a less dominating figure in the key position. After long discussion of the qualities of numerous men, including Lafayette, Carnot was apparently named to be First Consul if Bonaparte were removed from the scene. Whether or not Carnot knew about this decision, is a moot question. All plans, however, were thrown into disarray by the victory of Marengo that solidified Bonaparte's pre-eminence in the national system and public esteem. Mme. de Staël's romantic nature was, more than ever, fascinated by "the hero," and Lafayette presented his congratulations in person--the first of several friendly meetings that he was to have with Bonaparte during the following two years. Lafayette admitted that he developed admiration for Bonaparte as a man and as an administrator, but insisted that he frankly criticized Bonaparte's autocratic tendencies in his conversations with him. Lafayette arranged with Bonaparte for many favors for his friends and former companions-at-arms, but he consistently declined Bonaparte's invitations to himself to accept a senatorial or diplomatic appointment.

Bonaparte's desire to strengthen his position at home and abroad by a pact with Rome exasperated not only the liberals, but

many other anti-clerical tribunes, legislators, councillors of state, and ministers. In spite of Grégoire's efforts to divert Bonaparte's interest to the Constitutional church, and in the face of opposition from many official sources, Bonaparte persisted in his chosen course. The papal representative reached Paris in early November, 1800, and negotiations were in full swing when the second legislative session opened on November 22. Indirect means were found to express opposition to the idea of a concordat. For example, Grégoire received strong minority support on the two occasions during the session when the Corps Legislatif was called upon to nominate candidates for vacancies in the Senate.

In general, the liberal opposition in the debates of the Tribune showed marked improvement during this session; speeches were constructed better and occasional well-organized attacks from different angles by different speakers give the impression that there had been an assignment of topics and a division of labor. Possibly a comité des lumières, which one contemporary credits Constant with organizing, was at work behind the scenes. At all events, the session opened auspiciously for the opposition. The first measure, that was expected to give perfunctory approval to the government's reorganization of the administration of the national archives during the preceding months, was overwhelmingly defeated in both assemblies. When the tribunes proceeded to maul the next measure--a proposal to reduce the number and importance of the justices of the peace--Bonaparte withdrew every proposal on the legislative docket and left the assemblies without employment for a fortnight. The legislative machinery had just started to turn again when the royalists made an attempt on Bonaparte's life (December 24, 1800).

The nation was profoundly shocked by the event and Bonaparte exploited the widespread demand for swift action against the conspirators by inducing a majority in the Senate to promulgate, in the form of a "senatus consultum," his decree that named 130 republicans and Jacobins as the culprits and condemned them to deportation without trial. Accurate information is not available concerning the means by which Bonaparte persuaded the senators, over the objections of their liberal colleagues, to set the dangerous precedent which was to prove most useful to Bonaparte thereafter whenever he wished to circumvent the legislative bodies, the courts, and the restrictions of the constitution.



The legislative bodies were markedly quiet and cooperative during the period of the crisis. But the opposition came suddenly to life in mid-January over a measure that authorized the creation of special tribunals before which enemies of the public peace would be tried without juries and without appeal. Almost all of the liberals in the Tribunal participated in the heated attack upon the proposal. Nevertheless, a slight majority in that body approved the measure, and it was enacted by a substantial majority in the Corps Legislatif. Bonaparte was enraged by the behavior of the "metaphysicians" and "vermin" in the Tribunal. The press belavored the liberals viciously, and again Mme. de Staël's salon became deserted. The remainder of the busy session was something of an anti-climax; there was, however, sturdy opposition to several financial measures and the government was severely criticized for not submitting a budget, while a poorly-drafted measure that modified judicial procedure was roughly handled by Thiessé and Andrieux and was disapproved by both assemblies.

Although the summer and autumn of 1801 brought to France the unfamiliar tranquility of external peace and improved conditions at home, foreign diplomats reported many evidences of unrest, rumors of increasing disaffection among the generals and of opposition in important quarters to the concordat that had been signed and was ready for ratification by the legislative bodies. But when the third legislative session opened in late November and a notorious anti-clerical, Dupuis, was elected president of the Corps Legislatif, the concordat was not included among the treaties submitted to the legislative bodies. All went well, however, until the phrase "subjects of the two powers" was discovered in the treaty with Russia, and Thibault led a spirited attack upon it. Strong republican support was given his contention that citizens of France should not be called "subjects." Bonaparte personally took a hand in the matter, coached a group of loyal tribunes in the art of organizing their forces and choking debate, and succeeded in getting the treaty ratified. In spite of his eagerness to have the concordat ratified, he considered it advisable to test the temper of the legislative bodies with several sections of the Civil Code. When the Tribunal disapproved the first two sections and the Corps Legislatif rejected one, and when even the Senate joined in and elected Grégoire to its membership and appeared to be on the verge of electing Daunou,

Bonaparte went into action. On January 3, 1802, he retracted all legislative proposals and called for the "renewal" of one-fifth of the membership of the legislative bodies which the constitution scheduled for sometime during that year. The constitution did not, however, state the method by which the twenty tribunes and the sixty legislators who were to be unseated would be designated. The duty was finally assigned to the Senate that was subjected to heavy pressure by the Consuls and dutifully eliminated most of the trouble-making liberals. When the task was completed, only Andrieux and J.-B. Say remained in the Tribunate where they were joined by Carnot, the only liberal and one of the few men of any prominence among the new appointees to the legislative bodies.

The three liberals were hopelessly submerged in the Tribunate that, in addition to being "purified," was reorganized by being divided into three sections for secret discussion of measures before they were submitted, with recommendations for approval or disapproval, to the united body in public sessions. Those public meetings, during a forty-five-day special session in the spring of 1802, were most perfunctory. The concordat, the Treaty of Amiens, and scores of lesser measures were hurriedly approved in both houses, usually with no debate and with few negative votes being cast. However, even those chastened assemblies were stirred to surprising, although unsuccessful, opposition against the three proposals that regimented national education, re-established slavery in the colonies, and created the Legion of Honor. The two assemblies dutifully played their assigned rôles in the staged demand for "a glorious testimony of national gratitude" that resulted in the plebiscite on the question of the Consulate for Life.

The liberals were naturally exasperated by this development and expressed their ineffectual opposition in various ways. Carnot wrote the only "No" in the plebiscite register in the Tribunate and added a strong statement in the margin. Lafayette did much the same thing in recording his vote in his local register; in addition, he wrote a burning letter to Bonaparte and broke off all relations with him. Tradition has it that Cabanis, Chénier, and Garat added their efforts to those of representatives of almost all parties and factions that were unsuccessfully attempting to rouse General Moreau to lead a revolt against Bonaparte. Mme. de Staël and Constant expressed themselves sharply



on the subject in conversations and letters, and Mme. de Staël claimed to have had some connection with a still-born conspiracy that centered about General Bernadotte. She was successful in encouraging her friend Camille Jordan to write his Vrai sens du vote national sur le Consulat à vie,<sup>1</sup> in which he insisted that his affirmative vote, as well as that of the vast majority of citizens, was not to be interpreted as encouragement to Bonaparte to extend his personal power. On the contrary, Jordan claimed, the vote was evidence of the nation's confidence in Bonaparte's intention to limit his power and to guarantee liberty as well as sound institutions and order. Jordan stated that the nation desired liberty of the press, freedom from arbitrary arrests and imprisonment, the subordination of military forces to civil authority, a chief magistracy elected by national vote, and a bi-cameral legislature with elected representatives in the lower house and propertied life-members in the upper house. Although the police seized one edition of the book, another edition was put into circulation. The government took no action against Jordan.

On August 2, 1802, the Senate promulgated a senatus consultum declaring Bonaparte Consul for Life. Two days later another senatus consultum made extensive revisions in the constitution. The authority of the First Consul was greatly expanded at the expense of all other elements of government. The functions and prestige of the Senate were substantially increased, but since the First Consul gained practical control over its membership, Sieyès' Senate became an instrument by which Bonaparte could interpret the constitution as he pleased, legislate by means of senatus consulta, reverse decision of the courts, and dissolve the legislative bodies at will.

Those of the liberals who were inclined to continue the hopeless campaign against Bonaparte during the two years of the Consulate for Life had only one means of public expression left: they could still write books and could usually get them published. Bonaparte had just become Consul for Life when Necker's Dernières vues de politique et de finance<sup>2</sup> appeared. In this book, the

---

<sup>1</sup>[Camille Jordan], Vrai sens du vote national sur le Consulat à vie par le citoyen . . . se trouve à Paris (Paris: Chez les marchands des nouveautés, 1802).

<sup>2</sup>Jacques Necker, Dernières vues de politique et de finance, offertes à la nation française par M. Necker (Geneva, 1802).

elder statesman analyzed various types of government in an effort to find that form which he considered best fitted to the peculiar needs and conditions of the French people. He frankly analyzed the Constitution of the Year VIII as a pattern for a temporary dictatorship in a period of emergency. Necker personally preferred an hereditary limited monarchy, but he was convinced that no one, "not even Bonaparte," could successfully re-establish monarchy in France. Necker advocated a republican system with a multiple executive as the form of government most appropriate for France. He paid great respect to Bonaparte as the "necessary man" in time of crisis, but his view that Bonaparte's control should be relaxed and various elements of his system sloughed off as the emergency passed, and his open discussion of Bonaparte in relation to a monarchical system, caused the First Consul immense annoyance. He blamed Mme. de Staël, rather than her father, for the book. Her romance, Delphine,<sup>1</sup> that was published at the end of the year, completed his animosity toward her. In Delphine, Mme. de Staël extolled liberty, glorified the ideals and institutions of Protestant countries, advocated personal freedom, insisted upon the right of divorce, and severely criticized rigid social customs and the Catholic church. The book sealed her fate and Bonaparte exiled her from France. On her way to Weimar, she paused at Metz for a lengthy visit with Charles Villers whose Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la réformation de Luther,<sup>2</sup> appeared early in 1804. Villers analyzed human history as a perpetual struggle between liberty and authority, and credited human progress to an uninterrupted series of revolutions and reformations. Villers described the French Revolution as the "indispensable corollary" of the Reformation, and extolled Protestantism and republicanism.

Two other liberals produced books in which Bonaparte's economic policies and practices were weighed in Adam Smith's balance and found wanting. J.-B. Say's Traité d'économie politique<sup>3</sup> was a sober and comprehensive exposition of Smith's doctrines. Say cautiously avoided all reference to contemporary

---

<sup>1</sup>Baronne de Staël-Holstein, Delphine (Paris: Garnier; Geneva; Paschoud, An XI [1802-3]).

<sup>2</sup>Charles Villers, Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la Réformation de Luther (Paris: Henrichs; Meta; Collignon, 1804).

<sup>3</sup>Jean-Baptiste Say, Traité d'économie politique; ou simple exposition de la manière dont se forment, se distribuent, et se consomment les richesses (Paris: Deterville, 1803).



affairs and drew all of his illustrations from ancient history; nevertheless, his denunciations of war, of economic exploitation of conquered peoples, and of every form of governmental interference in economic matters were sufficiently pointed to result in a second edition of the work being forbidden. Sismondi's De la richesse<sup>1</sup> was an undisguised attempt to marshal such convincing evidence of the fallacy of protection that, if not all of France, at least Sismondi's city--Geneva--might be permitted to return to the free trade and prosperity that had prevailed before Geneva was annexed to France and subjected to French tariff regulations.

But all of these efforts were as futile as were the attempts of the liberals remaining in public office to prevent the establishment of the Empire. Carnot stood alone in the Tribunalate to oppose investing Bonaparte with hereditary power, while Grégoire and possibly two other liberals openly fought the inevitable in the Senate. With the establishment of the Empire, the liberals' defeat was complete, and for the succeeding decade most of them had no alternative to submission. Mme. de Staël alone continued her open duel with Napoleon. The liberals in the Senate were not permitted to resign, but performed few official functions; Lafayette gave his attention to agriculture; J.-B. Say declined his incongruous appointment as a collector of customs and founded and operated a cotton mill; most of the liberals devoted their energies to various fields of study. Daunou, Chénier, and Andrieux were not able to remain aloof from the regime, however, but were forced by necessity to accept positions in the bureaucracy of the Empire. Some of these liberals permanently forsook politics, but others among them were to reappear in 1814 and 1815, and continue under the Restoration and in 1830 to attempt to secure a government that would ensure liberty as well as security.

Raymond G. Carey

---

<sup>1</sup>J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi, De la richesse commerciale: ou principes d'économie politique appliqués à la législation du commerce (Geneva: Paschoud, 1803).









